

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/775,676	Applicant(s) DENTON ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew O. Savage	Art Unit 1724	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew O. Savage.

(2) John A. Molnar, Jr.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 September 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 3,-5, 7-9, 16-18, 20-24, and 26-52

Prior art documents discussed:

Williamson et al and Hanrahan

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to specify the first and second oleophilic materials as being a thermoplastic elastomer in claim 1 to patently distinguish over Williamson et al. Agreed to change "consolidated" to --unitary-- in claim 1 to avoid a potential obviousness rejection over Hanrahan. Also agreed to amend claim 1 to clarify the structure of the second stage as being "separate particles". Agreed to provide antecedent basis in the specification for the term "unitary" added to claim 1 on page 6 of the specification, the term having basis in original FIG. 1 of the drawings and because the first stage was disclosed to be formed by molding, sintering, or extruding obviously resulting in a unitary structure. Agreed to cancel claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 21, the subject matter of which had been incorporated into claim 1. Agreed to delete "oil-absorbing" from claims 7 and 20 for proper antecedence. Agreed to change "first" to --second-- in claim 23 to avoid redundancy with claim 10. Agreed to cancel claim 26, the structure of which had not been shown in the drawings. Agreed to correct the dependencies of claims 5, 7, 18, 20, and 24. Agreed to cancel non-elected claims 22 and 27-52. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details.